

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE United States Patent and Trademark Office Address COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS P O Box 1450 Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450 www.asylo.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
09/831,600	05/11/2001	Jouni Kivela	0365-0501P	5717
2592 7590 01/13/2010 BIRCH STEWART KOLASCH & BIRCH PO BOX 747			EXAMINER	
			CHEUNG, WILLIAM K	
FALLS CHURCH, VA 22040-0747			ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
			NOTIFICATION DATE	DELIVERY MODE
			01/13/2010	ELECTRONIC

# Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

Notice of the Office communication was sent electronically on above-indicated "Notification Date" to the following e-mail  $\,$  address(es):

mailroom@bskb.com

## Advisory Action Before the Filing of an Appeal Brief

Application No.	Applicant(s)	
09/831,600	KIVELA ET AL.	
Examiner	Art Unit	
WILLIAM K. CHEUNG	1796	

--The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

THE REPLY FILED 30 December 2009 FAILS TO PLACE THIS AP	PLICATION IN CONDITION FOR ALLOWANCE.
---	---------------------------------------

- 1. The reply was filed after a final rejection, but prior to or on the same day as filing a Notice of Appeal. To avoid abandonment of this application, applicant must timely file one of the following replies: (1) an amendment, affidavit, or other evidence, which places the application in condition for allowance; (2) a Notice of Appeal (with appeal fee) in compliance with 37 CFR 41.31; or (3) a Request for Continued Examination (RCE) in compliance with 37 CFR 1.114. The reply must be filed within one of the following time periods:
  - a) The period for reply expires 3 months from the mailing date of the final rejection.
  - b) The period for reply expires on: (1) the mailing date of this Advisory Action, or (2) the date set forth in the final rejection, whichever is later. In no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than SIX MONTHS from the mailing date of the final rejection.
    - Examiner Note: If box 1 is checked, check either box (a) or (b), ONLY CHECK BOX (b) WHEN THE FIRST REPLY WAS FILED WITHIN TWO MONTHS OF THE FINAL REJECTION. See MPEP 706 07(f)

Extensions of time may be obtained under 37 CFR 1.136(a). The date on which the petition under 37 CFR 1.136(a) and the appropriate extension fee have been filed is the date for purposes of determining the period of extension and the corresponding amount of the fee. The appropriate extension fee under 37 CFR 1.17(a) is calculated from: (1) the expiration date of the shortened statutory period for reply originally set in the final Office action; or (2) as set forth in (b) above, if checked. Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of the final rejection, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

## NOTICE OF APPEAL

The Notice of Appeal was filed on \_ filing the Notice of Appeal (37 CFR 41.37(a)), or any extension thereof (37 CFR 41.37(e)), to avoid dismissal of the appeal. Since a Notice of Appeal has been filed, any reply must be filed within the time period set forth in 37 CFR 41.37(a).

- AMENDMENTS 3. X The proposed amendment(s) filed after a final rejection, but prior to the date of filing a brief, will not be entered because

  - (a) ☑ They raise new issues that would require further consideration and/or search (see NOTE below);
    (b) ☐ They raise the issue of new matter (see NOTE below); (c) They are not deemed to place the application in better form for appeal by materially reducing or simplifying the issues for
  - appeal; and/or
  - (d) They present additional claims without canceling a corresponding number of finally rejected claims.
- NOTE: See Continuation Sheet. (See 37 CFR 1.116 and 41.33(a)). The amendments are not in compliance with 37 CFR 1.121. See attached Notice of Non-Compliant Amendment (PTOL-324).
- Applicant's reply has overcome the following rejection(s):
- 6. Newly proposed or amended claim(s) would be allowable if submitted in a separate, timely filed amendment canceling the
- non-allowable claim(s). 7. X For purposes of appeal, the proposed amendment(s): a) x will not be entered, or b) will be entered and an explanation of how the new or amended claims would be rejected is provided below or appended.
  - The status of the claim(s) is (or will be) as follows:
  - Claim(s) allowed: none.
  - Claim(s) objected to: none.
  - Claim(s) rejected: 1,3,4,7-25,29 and 31-34.
  - Claim(s) withdrawn from consideration: none.

### AFFIDAVIT OR OTHER EVIDENCE

- 8. The affidavit or other evidence filed after a final action, but before or on the date of filing a Notice of Appeal will not be entered because applicant failed to provide a showing of good and sufficient reasons why the affidavit or other evidence is necessary and was not earlier presented. See 37 CFR 1.116(e).
- 9. The affidavit or other evidence filed after the date of filing a Notice of Appeal, but prior to the date of filing a brief, will not be entered because the affidavit or other evidence failed to overcome all rejections under appeal and/or appellant fails to provide a showing a good and sufficient reasons why it is necessary and was not earlier presented. See 37 CFR 41,33(d)(1),
- 10. The affidavit or other evidence is entered. An explanation of the status of the claims after entry is below or attached.

### REQUEST FOR RECONSIDERATION/OTHER

- 11. The request for reconsideration has been considered but does NOT place the application in condition for allowance because: See Continuation Sheet.
- Note the attached Information Disclosure Statement(s), (PTO/SB/08) Paper No(s).
- 13. ☐ Other:

/William K Cheung/ Primary Examiner, Art Unit 1796 January 6, 2010

Continuation of 3. NOTE: The proposed amendment for independent claims 1, 13, 14, 29, 35, "a gas is returned into the gas phase reactor at a point above the level of the fluidized bed", and "recovered lumps are withdrawn from a collecting vessel throug a second outlet nozzle" introduces new issues that would require further consideration and/or search by the examiner.

Continuation of 11. does NOT place the application in condition for allowance because: In view of new issues, the proposed amendment has not been entered. Therefore, claims 1, 3, 4-725, 29, and 31-34 stand rejected for the reasons adequates toff throm the final rejection of July 30, 2009. Regarding applicants' argument that the claimed invention is different from the one disclosed in Bernier et al. because Bernier et al. do not teach a process that is carried in both continuously and discontinuously at the same time, the examiner disagrees because nothing in Bernier et al. requires Bernier et al. to run the process with outlets running all continuously or intermittently (discontinuously, in view that there are only two choices (continuous or discontinuous) for each of the outlets, the examiner has a reasonable basis to believe that the rationale set forth for the rejection is adequate. Regarding applicants' argument that the outlet nozzle of Bernier et al. is not connected to the reactor as claimed, the argument is not supported by the claims as written; the claims only require "at the same level as the fluidized bed." In view of the reasons set forth above, the relections set forth in the final rejection of July 30, 2009 are proper.